

# Australian Corporations Law Journal

ISSN 1321-747X

23 April, 2007.

Issue #: 200701

Publisher: Australian Law Publishers Pty Ltd [ACN 010 615 933] [AuLP] E: [info@AustLawPublish.com](mailto:info@AustLawPublish.com)

<http://austlawpublish.com> 254 Hawken Drive, St Lucia, Qld. 4067.

Skype: russellmathews

Editor-in-Chief: **Russell G H Mathews BCom BSc LLB BA**

**keywords:** Coles attitude to customers; the Coles SALUTE; Coles gesture; law of supermarket express lane; Trade Practices representation by Coles; intended to attract customers; misrepresentation; no intention by Coles to ensure representation true, or even partly reliable; records in Coles files showing criminal conduct; most "protected" by "legal Professional privilege; available in DUE DILIGENCE; Coles knows it holds evidence of corruption; Coles knew Haig being prosecuted on false charges, yet did nothing to assist prevent improper charges; bad corporate citizen; Coles vicariously liable for crimes of staff; Coles sacked staff; Coles concealed evidence of previous staff's crime;

## Coles salute to the World



*Illustration 1: Explicit attitude of Coles staff including Linda Maree Wease, leading to her corrupt cover-up and her Criminal Perjury LONG REALISED BY COLES. HAIGPHOTO*

**On a much deeper level, this photo detailed in this articles, it permeates displays the corporeal attitude of all the way down from Senior Coles to the WORLD, not just Management of Coles to the staff in customers. This attitude pervades each store. While this may occur the whole Coles organization, not unconsciously as it approaches the just the staff at the shop-face. As shop-face, as the evidence will**

suggest, it is deliberate at the Senior level of management and the legal section of **Coles**.

When our photographer Haig, presented us with this image of the **Coles** salute to customers, we realised its importance. It leads many of our Journals this month. When we archive these on our website, we will include a link to a new page of “Coles Related Journals”. This photo seems to exemplify the attitude of **Coles'** staff to customers including to the concept of an “express lane”, the major topic of this issue.

Consider the event which so many ordinary Australians have probably often experienced: Picking up one item at the supermarket and paying for it via the “express lane” only to find that an inconsiderate person with well over the set limit, has decided to cause others inconvenience because there is a big queue at the normal checkouts.

Our now formalized official photographer, Haig, lives near a Coles Supermarket. He is disabled but very intelligent, and seems to “think outside the square” somewhat. He is into worm-farming, keeping ducks and recycling. In early 2004, he was collecting unsold bread from a local bread-shop, five evenings per fortnight. They had a contract that

would provide Haig with the bread, about four shopping trolley loads each night, in Coles' shopping trolleys. The bread shop would also use a “stray” **Coles'** shopping trolley, for themselves to take their rubbish, [usually quite voluminous], to the bins. The then manager of Coles, one Linda Maree Wease, gave them an old plastic shopping trolley that she had, for their use, and two of the old plastic shopping trolleys to Haig, with the promise that they and Haig not use **Coles'** trolleys any more. That was agreed. With three trolleys, it meant that one had to be emptied immediately and refilled each night, and another emptied and returned to the bread shop.

We will describe Linda Maree Wease. She stated in a subsequent affidavit that she was aged 40 years in 2005. She spoke like she was a bushie, with a broad Aussie accent: “How'ya goin' mate; yeh mate”. Every one was always “mate”, “mate this” and “mate that”. She had very short hair, slim and wore slacks. It seems as though many of her staff at that time fitted that same general description; very short hair and slacks. Telstra White Pages shows an L M Wease at two different addresses in SE Queensland. We will not publish them here.

A few days later, on the footpath outside her Coles store, Wease told Haig that she had some more

shopping trolleys “downstairs, in the carpark” that he could have so he could “fix them up”. She clearly thought he was a simpleton. Haig told us this from the way she spoke to him. His intelligence and qualifications belies his appearance. Firstly, he is disabled. He looks odd, long beard, and wears an old weather beaten hat most of the time, even at night, and seems to act like an eccentric. We are confident in his ability and have made him our official photographer.

Given the situation of having too few trolleys for the bread, Haig tells us that the possibility of owning more trolleys, sounded attractive at the time. He went down with her to inspect the “shopping trolleys that he could fix up [a la Wease]”. There were 11. Most were rusted, with the wire mesh badly bent or severed with many sharp ends of wire and missing the handle and some or all wheels as they had been “cannibalized” to repair the Coles’ stock of shopping trolleys. She was persistent that he could “fix them up”, she was most insistent, and added that “it would be doing (her) a favour”. There was one there that seemed in perfect condition, except that it was missing one wheel. She alerted Haig to this. She added that Haig could put pot-plants in them in his yard. Haig reluctantly agreed to take them all, as he tells us, she was repeating that it would be doing her

a favour, and he had the space to store them and thought, that at worst, they could be used to reinforce concrete, or sold as scrap metal, after he had used any of the metal himself. Haig tells us that he did not think that she would have appreciated his agreeing to take just the ones he selected. Wease was so eager to be rid of them, she helped him move them up to his front gate. That was when she relayed the facts about the new contractor and Melbourne HQ authorizing her to dump the good one, missing one wheel. She told Haig that they had had a change of “trolley maintenance contractor”, and the new contractor refused to fix that one as he said it was not his responsibility. She further advised Haig that she had referred this to Melbourne HQ, and they authorized her to “dump it”, so, she said, she could give it to him.

Apart from the trolley that was missing only one wheel, Haig was able to salvage only two more. One was missing the baby/toddler seat, and the other was twisted such that only three wheels could be in contact with the ground/floor, at any particular time. Hence, he still needed to empty one trolley each night and return it to be filed a second time that night. Haig tells us that he always asked them in the bread shop, to fill that “wobbly” one last so he did not have to use it a

second time that evening.

Haig tells us that a few weeks later he found another trolley hard against his front gate such that he could not exit his yard without moving it. An individual known to Haig, who was sitting at the nearby bus-stop, came over to Haig and told him, incredulously, of this woman who had pushed the empty trolley over to his gate, and pushed it hard against his front gate. He described Wease. The trolley was twisted, like a few of the ones Wease had given him earlier. He reasoned that she had put it there for him. The next day she asked Haig if he had found it and that it was for him. Another three similarly twisted ones appeared in the same circumstances. From those, Haig was able to salvage only four that were satisfactory. He tells us that he was feeling swamped by the increasing number of faulty trolleys that she was leaving there. He always checked them, and they were always defective. When he had a fifth usable one, Haig decided that it would be a good gesture to give her back the good one on which he had fitted a new wheel. He thought he might be able to say to her, “enough” with the defective trolleys. Haig went into the store and asked for her but the staff told him that she had been transferred to be manager at Coles in the Myer Centre in Brisbane, just the day before.

Giving all the wrecked trolleys to Haig did save her a job, but apparently, it is against the policy of Coles. Regardless, Haig maintains that he still had good legal title to those defective trolleys including the one that he had repaired with the mere fitting of a wheel. We agree. Haig had good and proper legal title to the ownership of those trolleys. That she may be in breach of Coles internal policy, does not mean that Haig's title is any less effective.

Apparently, the new manager saw Haig with the four trolleys which he would wheel over to the bread shop, five evenings per fortnight and then return them to his home, and retained them there. Apparently, he asked Wease, who told him that she had given Haig the plastic ones but that he must have stolen the metal ones.

Following the episode described in our [Australian Criminal Law Journal of 29 January, 2007 issue #200701](#), when the three criminal scum nominally employed by the Brisbane City Council [BCC], invaded his home and stole his property without the mandatory court order which could be gained only after giving Haig his Due Process of his Right to be heard as enshrined in Common Law and the relevant statute, those BCC lowlife called the police to assist their illegal

entry, and subsequent theft of much of Haig's property, because the BCC lowlife thought they could get away with it, [they have to now, but, with our assistance, Haig will obtain final reckoning, with these BCC criminals, being charged with the criminal offences], and they envied his voluminous potting mix with which he was improving his yard, that they could take for themselves and give to their mates.

When the presence of these shopping trolleys became known to a corrupt yet ambitious cop name Snr Constable Henri Elias Rantala, he decided he could take on this disabled and eccentric guy name Haig, because he would be an easy target and that would make that Rorting Rantala look good and secure him promotions. This is usual for the Queensland Police Service [QPS] lowlife cops to target individuals. In a period of only a few months, Rorting Rantala initiated FIVE charges against Haig. Haig beat him on all five.

When Rorting returned with two other officers to "seize" the rusting and junk trolleys, together with the four that Haig had made workable, Haig 'phoned Wease. She was abusive and told Haig that he should not be talking to her. Whereupon, Haig emailed Coles in Melbourne and told them the situation. He gave them enough to be able to determine

that Wease was lying. They gave Wease a copy of that email. Wease was subsequently terminated as employee. Coles were aware that Haig was being prosecuted. He advised them.

What is relevant to Coles involvement, is that Wease broke Coles' policy rules, to make her job easier, lied about it to other Coles' employees, lied about it to police, and then PERJURED HERSELF in an affidavit. Coles knew all this [terminated her to protect themselves], yet did nothing to right the wrong being done to Haig. That was the act required by a good corporate citizen, but Coles failed.

We are sure that Coles dislikes its ethical and moral default being publicized. They would no doubt, have attempted to place as much of the relevant communication to be nominally protected by Legal Profession Privilege [LPP]. They cannot do that after the event; well not honestly anyway. Importantly, Coles cannot with-hod that from "Due dilligence".

Of course, these acts by Coles, are actually acts by some individuals within Coles. That Coles is now on the "auction block" has opportunities for Haig. We are happy to lend our facilities to his assistance.

There are a number of possibilities. That the ownership/control of Coles will change is certain. That the records of Coles will be available to be scrutinized by others, as in due diligence, is also certain.

Linda Maree Wease and Coles will most certainly not be pleased by this publicity. There are many records within Coles that would be available to be discovered in any court hearing. These would show precisely what Haig alleges. These records, as well as those protected by LPP, will be available to those doing due diligence.

If anyone wishes to sue us over this, that will give us an opportunity to obtain discovery of these crucial documents. Such will also thrust an extra uncertainty into the “takeover” of Coles, causing much uncertainty. There will be many individuals representing large sums of money who will not want such uncertainty. Uncertainty causes nervousness which in turn causes costs. 1% of \$20 billion is \$200 million; a small percent cost but a large sum of money. Many will now realize that Coles' improper ethical position then, was unwise.

Linda Maree Wease may wish to sue. Coles will not want that and would presumably let her know quickly that they can release the information to prove what she did was criminal. That is what Coles' solicitor did with the Queensland DPP when the DPP/police were suing Haig over “possession of

tainted property” being the rusted and junk shopping trolleys, because Haig had subpoenaed all this information from Coles. [The police had first charged Haig for “stealing” the shopping trolleys, but Coles steadfastly refused to claim ownership of them, despite repeated requests from the Queensland Police Service [QPS] and the Queensland DPP, so the DPP/QPS had to discontinue that.] Coles let the DPP know in no uncertain terms that the info Haig had subpoenaed would put him in the clear. The DPP then offered no evidence. It was only Haig's wisdom that prevented his being harmed by Coles shame.

The uncertainty of a Coles law suit will auger against Coles suing. This is a minefield within the records of Coles. We are certain that KKR and Westfarmers will not wish to assume the liability of the Wease minefield. Any written directions given to their accountants and auditors performing the Due Diligence [DD], could become public. These things happen. Surely, they will wish to defuse the minefield, so they do not have to assume it, by whatever means.

Of course, Haig always has the option of suing Coles at this time. What we want!! We want to gain publicity for our journals and websites. Our Coles' articles on the www are already attracting attention from Coles, but far more from specific sites, whose identity is known to us, in the USA, other than the search engines.